

under unanimous consent, I include in the Record at this point the text of Connie Black's unique and interesting answer to this question:

CAN I BE, OR SHOULD I DO?

(By Connie Ann Black)

"My son is president of his school's student body," she stated proudly, matter-of-factly. "What does your son do?"

She answered quietly, "Do? What does anyone do? My son is—that is enough."

Some men are "born" leaders and they become presidents, newspaper editors, and den fathers. They organize corporations, hospitals, and citizens' city-beautiful committees; they guide, propel, conduct, and direct. Without them there would be no organized institutions—no republics, labor unions, church hierarchies, or PTA's.

Other men are—and that is enough. Their leadership is neither active nor passive, but exists as an intangible part of their personalities. These men are loved, honored, or despised because of what they are and not because of what they do. In them, deed and being are one.

In me deed and being are often one. I don't want to be Senior Honor Society Secretary or First Woman Executive of the United States, and I resent it when people suggest that I should run for an office, should "do something." Sometimes I wish I could become a botanist living in a laboratory crowded with geraniums and hybrid pea plants or a professional student consuming semester after semester of calculus, world history, and paleontology. I think how marvelous it would be if I went to college, majored in English, received a degree in pediatric medicine, and then became a passive leader. I could tickle my patients' toes and discuss Far Eastern politics and Aristotelian logic with their parents. I would be—and that would be enough.

But then something—my rational mind, my conscience, something—says, "Are you capable of becoming a quiet leader. Are you sure that you could just 'be,' and the world would benefit?" And I reply, "Yes, Yes, this is the kind of leader I am meant to be. I would * * * well, I would * * * really, I mean * * * I don't know. I don't know."

I am going to college to study the humanities—to learn of artists, scientists, and philosophers; to understand myself. During 4 years of study I will grow a little taller and begin to think a little more maturely. I will be able to decide whether I should be president or quiet leader. Then I will know that I must "do" or that I should "be."

Cuba's Power Grid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTAIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1963

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to submit an article which appeared in the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily on June 15. The author, Mr. Jesse Gordon, has been listed by Andrew Tully in "CIA: The Inside Story," as one of the few expert observers on conditions within the island:

CUBA'S POWER GRID

(By Jesse Gordon)

Recent reports that Khrushchev has promised to build a second 300,000-kilowatt powerplant for Castro—the largest in Cuba—high-

lights the enormous contribution the Russians and Czechoslovakians are making to Cuba's electric power grid and the island's industrialization program.

Some observers believe that Khrushchev's pledge to Castro for the 300,000 kilowatt powerplant was designed to assuage the Cuban leader's still-hurt feelings resulting from the Soviet backdown on the missile crisis. But whatever its motivation, the new plant will add significantly to the Communist bloc's contribution to Cuba's electrification.

Following is a summary of what Soviet-bloc countries are building for Castro's growing power grid, according to Mario Fleites, head of Cuba's Department of Electrification:

In early 1964, and early 1965, four Soviet-built power stations, each generating 50,000 kilowatts, will be installed at Mariel, Province of Pinar del Rio. The Mariel site will be the location for new glass and aluminum factories, including a shipyard.

A large electric powerplant at Nipe, on the northern coast of Cuba, to be built by 1967, which will generate 300,000 kilowatts and cost \$50 million. It will serve the expansion needs of the Moa Bay nickel plant nearby, and a new nickel plant to cost \$250 million, which the Russians are also building at Nipe.

Two Soviet-built power stations generating 50,000 kilowatts each will be completed by 1966 at Santiago de Cuba in the Province of Oriente. An entire industrial development project is going up in this area, including a factory to manufacture autos and trucks.

A Czech-built plant generating power of 30,000 kilowatts will be completed by July 1964 and installed at O'Bourke (Cienfuegos). Two more Czech plants, each generating 60,000 kilowatts, are being erected at Nuevitas in Camaguey Province, and will be finished by October 1965. The Nuevitas power sources will supply current to a complex of new factories in the area for the manufacture of fertilizers, electrodes, barbed wire, and cement.

A Czech-built 30,000-kilowatt plant is to be constructed at Punta Martillo, 15 miles from Manzanillo in Oriente and will be finished by 1966. The present power station at Matanzas will be increased by 37,500 kilowatts with the installation of a turbogenerator manufactured in France. The Matanzas site will include new factories for fertilizers, acids, and a textile mill.

The 5-year electrification plan is estimated to cost \$210 million, according to Fleites. This is exclusive of Khrushchev's recent promise to Fidel Castro of an additional powerplant.

"Before determining the location of new powerplants," Fleites said, "it is necessary to take into account all possible annual increases in maximum demand or peak load. In figuring the peak load, a yearly increase of 10 percent is estimated."

Fleites, who works directly under Che Guevara, the Minister of Industry, took his B.S. in mechanical engineering at Louisiana State University in 1946, and his master's degree in electrical engineering at the University of Michigan. He later worked in the United States.

State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary Appropriation Bill, 1964

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

The House on Committee of the Whole
House on the State of the Union had under

consideration the bill (H.R. 7063) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered to H.R. 7063 by the distinguished gentleman from California which would reduce by \$19,491,000 the appropriation for contributions to international organizations recommended by the Committee on Appropriations. Purportedly, the assumption of this amendment was that the figure represented an unpaid just debt owed by the United Nations to the U.S. Department of Defense for expenses incurred by the peacekeeping efforts in the Congo. The gentleman from California contended that this reduction would actually be taken only from the U.S. assessment for membership in the United Nations, which figure is \$31,330,445. He held that the withholding of such funds would signify only a sense of fiscal responsibility on the part of Congress, and the fulfillment of just commitments both by the United Nations—in that it would thereby eliminate a debt, though without direct action on its part—and by the United States—as one principle of membership is cognizance by the member of the financial obligations of the body to which he belongs.

Unfortunately the amendment revealed a lack of awareness both of the nature of the appropriation itself, and of the purposes for which the funds will be employed. The appropriations recommended were for membership and other regular assessments pursuant to being an integral part of the United Nations, and were well within the 33 1/3-percent ceiling imposed by American law on the financial obligations of our great Nation to any international organization. In addition, the money recommended had nothing whatsoever to do with peacekeeping operations in the Middle East, the Congo, or anywhere else all of which was eloquently stated by the gentleman from New York in debate over the amendment. Such contingencies are seen to by other means, beyond the normal assessments which will be covered by the \$81,305,000 recommended in this bill for contributions to international organizations. What the amendment entailed, in actuality, was a withdrawal by the United States from the fulfillment of its normal membership obligations, much in the manner with which the Soviet Union is accustomed to approach its financial obligations to the United Nations. In fact, it is for just such irresponsible fiscal behavior that the Soviet Union is facing the crisis of the loss of its vote in the General Assembly.

Most tragic, however, are the human implications presented in a discussion of the impact of such a cut in the international organizations appropriation. One need only review the list of agencies and organizations which will receive financial contributions from the proposed \$81,305,000; among them are: The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—(UNESCO); the World Health Organization—WHO; the Food and Agriculture Organiza-

A3966

tion—FAO; the International Labor Organization—ILO; the Inter-American Children's Institute; the Pan American Health Organization. Contributions to these organizations alone total more than \$27 million, and human assistance—and HOPE—rendered thereby more than justify the financial commitment. The improvement of standards of living, the amelioration of working conditions, the elimination of disease, the provision for children of greater opportunities for growing up in a world where they have a chance, the introduction of education, food, and other facets of societal well-being and advancement into areas which have not yet entered the 20th century on equal terms with other nations of the world—all of these would suffer from any proposed cut.

What of defensive and political alignments which insure the security of the United States? The Organization of American States is one of the international organizations supported by this appropriation, as are NATO, SEATO, the Colombo Plan, and the OECD. Any proposals to reduce our commitments and/or support to these organizations must be viewed in the cold light of national security, and within the broader perspective of the respect in which we are held by other nations of the world. Relationships with our Latin-American neighbors, the question of the Atlantic Alliance, and the precariousness of the situation in Asia render a reduction in American support well-nigh inconceivable at this time.

Other organizations which would receive funds from the recommended appropriations are the international administrative organizations, the services rendered by which are essentially of a nonpolitical, cooperative nature among nations, and are aimed at international harmonization and coordination of such matters as weights and measures, telecommunications, and celestial exploration.

In summation, one can see that any reduction in the amount recommended by the Committee on Appropriations for contributions to international organizations would be most detrimental to the U.S. position of leadership in the promotion of world peace, freedom from disease, freedom from hunger, advancement of educational opportunities, and in the preservation of that body which provides the forum for reconciliation and cooperation among nations. The proposed amendment, which would reduce the allocation by more than \$19 million, seems to maintain as its underlying objective the weakening and eventual dissolution of the entire United Nations structure, for without U.S. leadership, commitment, and responsibility, that body is able to retain no truly effective hope for the maintenance of international peace or the reduction of tensions between states. Failure to live up to our obligations of membership places us in the position of tacit accord with the Soviet Union's objective of breaking up the United Nations, as the gentleman from New York pointed out in the debate on the amendment.

Even with a mature realization of its inherent limitations, we must recognize that the United Nations has played a highly significant role in international relations. The settlement of disputes between states and the containment of skirmishes which threaten wider conflict, the facilitation of independence and freedom for formerly dependent territories, the advances in human welfare in underdeveloped areas of the world, and the provision of a forum for peace—all these factors make it incumbent upon the Congress to approve the full amount of the contributions to international organizations, as recommended by the Committee on Appropriations.

State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary Appropriation Bill, 1964

SPEECH
OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7093) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I shall find it necessary to vote against this bill. This, to me, presents a difficult situation because my committee reported the bill. I realize that it covers many agencies of Government, most of which are doing satisfactory work. It may appear inconsistent to vote against a bill which contains funds for many necessary functions of Government, but I vote against it to protest a situation which I consider intolerable. I refer in particular to the Supreme Court decision outlawing Bible reading and recital of the Lord's Prayer in public schools. Apparently this is in keeping with the Court's preoccupation with the new fetish for minority rights. In recent years the Court has plunged headlong into a morass of social experiments, wholly without precedent, which in substance say that any so-called rights demanded by a vocal minority must prevail over the views of the majority. In its zeal to give the militant minority whatever it chooses to demand in the name of "rights," the Court perforce has ridden roughshod over the rights of the majority. The net effect of the Court's new strained interpretations of its constitutional responsibilities is to undermine all human rights. No individual henceforth can consider himself secure in any rights and protections heretofore commonly understood and assumed.

In its most recent ruling, the U.S. Supreme Court has struck a body blow at our Constitution. It has placed an interpretation of the wording of the Constitution that was never intended by the Founding Fathers. They were

deeply religious men. All they sought to do was to prevent the establishment of a state church. They could not have dreamed that their wording would be used as an argument against religion itself. To take religion out of the public schools is to take a long step toward the adoption of an atheistic doctrine. This is another blow at the bright symbolism which made this country the hope of the world for so many years. The decision has cheapened America and weakened its moral strength. I sincerely hope the Congress will rebel against the things that are happening to our country and its people and reassert the principles which made us a great nation. As a first step, the Supreme Court must be curbed. My vote against this bill is a vote against the Supreme Court for which funds are carried in the bill. The situation brought on by the Court is so grave that I consider a protest vote is necessary.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of this Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1987).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent; *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.